

**REMARKS:**

Claims 2 and 15-17 are in the case and presented for consideration.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. The reason for this rejection is stated at page 3 of the Office Action. Claim 15 has been amended to make it dependent from claim 2 and is now believed to be in proper form.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 2 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Irmischer et al. (US Patent 4,514,405). The reasons for this rejection are stated at pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

Claim 2 has been amended to eliminate the compounds disclosed in Irmischer et al. and, therefore, claim 2 is believed to be allowable. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 2 and therefore are believed to likewise allowable.

Applicants have endeavored to make the foregoing response sufficiently complete to permit prompt, favorable action on the subject patent application. In the event that the Examiner believes, after consideration of this response, that the prosecution of the subject patent application would be expedited by an interview with an authorized representative of the Applicants; the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (845) 359-7700.

By this amendment, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/PETER C. MICHALOS/  
Peter C. Michalos  
Reg. No. 28,643  
Attorney for Applicants  
(845) 359-7700

Dated: May 6, 2008

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

**Customer No. 21706**

M:\PAT-AMD\J507-005\J507-005US-Amendment2.wpd